

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/813,200	HIRANO, MITSUHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven H. Rao	2814

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Steven H. Rao (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Elliot Goldberg (33,347) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 03 February 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 10,11,16 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shiraiwa and others applied in the O/A of 07/16/2002.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

- i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments. Applicants' arguments over came the pending 112 rejections. The Saeki reference applied in the outstanding O/A is duplicate and cited for the same teaching as Yanagawa. In the rejection of November 22, 2000 element 32 is applied only once and the second applied element is 32d which is different from 32 and fig. 2 32d is shown at one point attached to 32 as dust is removed by 32, 32d inherently removes dust as also explained in fig. 11 and vol. 2 lines 54 to 57. The Examiner will fully consider the reply in due course. .